

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>WILLIAM THROWER,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:11-CV-1663</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</b>	:	
<i>et al.,</i>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 14th day of November, 2011, upon consideration of plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 20) of this court's order of October 19, 2011 (Doc. 13), severing and transferring certain claims to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and it appearing that plaintiff fails to demonstrate one of three major grounds for reconsideration ((1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence [not available previously]; [or], (3) the need to correct clear error [of law] or prevent manifest injustice.'')), North River Ins. Co. v. Cigna Reinsurance Co., 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995) (citations omitted); see Waye v. First Citizen's Nat'l Bank, 846 F. Supp. 310, 314 (M.D. Pa.) ("A motion for reconsideration is not to be used to reargue matters already argued and disposed of."), aff'd, 31 F.3d 1174 (3d Cir. 1994); see also Database America, Inc. v. Bellsouth Adver. & Publ'g Corp., 825 F. Supp. 1216, 1220 (D.N.J. 1993) (citations omitted) ("A party seeking reconsideration must show more than a disagreement with the Court's decision, and 'recapitulation of the cases and arguments

considered by the court before rendering its original decision fails to carry the moving party's burden.'"), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration (Doc. 20) is DENIED.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge